

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3 DARIUS HULLUM,

4 Plaintiff,

5 vs.

6 PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE
7 COMPANY,

8 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00396-GMN-DJA

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
REMAND**

9 Pending before the Court is the Motion to Remand, (ECF No. 11), filed by Plaintiff
10 Darius Hullum. Defendant failed to file a Response by the April 14, 2025, deadline. Under
11 Local Rule 7-2(d) “[t]he failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to
12 any motion . . . constitutes a consent to the granting of the motion.” Defendant was on notice
13 of the pending Motion because Plaintiff served the Motion electronically through the Court’s e-
14 filing system. (See Mot. Remand at 7, ECF No. 11). Moreover, Defendant expressly
15 acknowledged the filing of the pending Motion in its Joint Status Report. (See Joint Status
16 Report 2:3, ECF No. 12) (“Action Required by Court: Determination of Plaintiff’s Motion to
17 Remand.”). Thus, the Court construes Defendant’s failure to file a Response as a consent to the
18 granting of the Motion to Remand.

19 Accordingly,

20 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand, (ECF No. 11), is
21 **GRANTED.**

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is kindly directed to **REMAND** this case to the Eighth Judicial District Court of Clark County, Nevada for further proceedings. The Clerk of Court is also kindly directed to close this case.

Dated this 1 day of May, 2025.

Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
United States District Court